

SKADDEN, ARPS, SLATE, MEAGHER

MEMO ENDORSED

FOUR TIMES SQUARE
NEW YORK 10036-6522

TEL: (212) 735-3000

FAX: (212) 735-2000

www.skadden.com

FIRM/AFFILIATE OFFICES

BOSTON
CHICAGO
HOUSTON
LOS ANGELES
PALO ALTO
SAN FRANCISCO
WASHINGTON, D.C.
WILMINGTON

BEIJING
BRUSSELS
FRANKFURT
HONG KONG
LONDON
MOSCOW
MUNICH
PARIS
SINGAPORE
SYDNEY
TOKYO
TORONTO
VIENNA

DIRECT DIAL
212-735-3567
DIRECT FAX
917-777-3567
EMAIL ADDRESS
MGRUENGL@SKADDEN.COM

November 17, 2005

BY HAND

Honorable Kenneth M. Karas
United States District Judge
United States District Court
Southern District of New York
500 Pearl Street, Room 920
New York, New York 10007

USDC SDNY
DOCUMENT
ELECTRONICALLY FILED
DOC #:
DATE FILED: 11/22/05

Re: In re JAKKS Pacific, Inc. Shareholders
Class Action Litigation, 04-CV-8807-KMK

Dear Judge Karas:

We write on behalf of Defendants to address two issues relating to the briefing of Defendants' Motion to Dismiss the Consolidated Amended Complaint.

1. Your Honor's November 4, 2005 Memo Endorsed Letter granted Lead Plaintiffs an additional week to respond to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss the Consolidated Amended Complaint, which would have the effect, which we believe unintended, of truncating the period for preparation of our reply. Under the original briefing schedule contained in Your Honor's May 11, 2005 Order, Defendants' reply was to be served on or before December 8, 2005, thirty days after the original deadline for Lead Plaintiffs' opposition papers. We do not believe the Court intended that the additional time awarded to Lead Plaintiffs would shorten the Defendants' period in which to reply. As we do not wish to presume that our understanding is correct, we respectfully request that the Court confirm that the thirty days allotted for Defendants' reply is not affected by the November 4, 2005 Order, which would mean that Defendants will serve their reply no later than December 15, 2005, one week after the original due date.

2. On November 15, 2005, without any advance notice, Lead Plaintiffs filed the attached Notice of Motion to Strike Certain Exhibits. In so doing, Lead Plaintiffs did not seek the pre-motion conference required by Rule 2 of Your Honor's Individual Rules of Practice – even though counsel for Lead Plaintiffs communicated with the Court by letter as recently as November 3. In light of the possible alteration this unauthorized motion would cause to the briefing schedule established in the Court's Orders, Defendants seek the Court's guidance as to whether, and if so, when, they should respond to Lead Plaintiffs' motion.

Defendants are given until December 22, 2005 to file their Reply Memorandum and to respond to Plaintiffs' motion to strike. Plaintiffs are not to file a reply regarding the motion to strike.

cc: All Counsel (via email)

Respectfully submitted,

Michael H. Gruenglas

SO ORDERED

KENNETH M. KARAS U.S.D.J.

11/21/05